

**In The Drawings**

Please modify Fig. 2 as shown in the Annotated (marked-up-in-red) copy of Fig. 2 enclosed herewith. A revised Replacement (formal) drawing is enclosed for approval.

## REMARKS

New claims 57-61 are added. Support for the new claims is provided by the originally-filed application at, for example, Fig. 2 and pages 17-19.

Fig. 2 of the drawings is amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 2-4, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,544). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,876,074).

Independent claim 7 is amended to recite wherein an entirety of at least one of the contact pads is elevationally spaced from at least one of the first and the second surfaces of the dielectric support member. Support for the amendment language is provided by the originally-filed application at, for example, Fig. 2. Regarding Hashimoto, the Examiner relies on “conductive material” that fills holes 18 (see Fig. 2 of Hashimoto) to allegedly teach the positively recited contact pads, and further relies on substrate 10 of Hashimoto to allegedly teach the positively recited dielectric support member. However, the “conductive material” of Hashimoto has opposite surfaces that are **coplanar** with respective opposite sides of substrate 10 (one side with electrodes 40 (solder balls) and the other opposite side with lands 16 (alleged recited traces)). That is, Hashimoto teaches “conductive material” (alleged compact pads) that is **not elevationally spaced** from either one of the respective opposite sides of substrate 10. Accordingly, it is inconceivable that Hashimoto teaches or suggests wherein an entirety of at least one of the contact pads is elevationally spaced from at least one of the first and the second surfaces of the dielectric support member as positively recited by claim 7. Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 7, and therefore, claim 7 is allowable over Hashimoto.

Moreover, regarding the Kim reference, the Examiner relies on “conductive material” that fills vias 228 (see Fig. 3 of Kim) to allegedly teach the positively recited contact pads with tape 221 of Kim to allegedly teach the positively recited dielectric support member. However, the “conductive material” of Kim has opposite surfaces that are **coplanar** with respective opposite sides of tape 221 (one side with wire pattern 231 and the other opposite side with wire pattern 233). That is, Kim teaches “conductive material” (alleged compact pads) that is **not elevationally spaced** from either one of the respective opposite sides of tape 221. Accordingly, it is inconceivable that Kim teaches or suggests wherein an entirety of at least one of the contact pads is **elevationally spaced from at least one of the first and the second surfaces of the dielectric support member** as positively recited by claim 7. Kim fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 7, and therefore, claim 7 is allowable over Kim.

No other rejections are presented against independent claim 7, and therefore, claim 7 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 8 and 57-61 depend from independent claim 7, and therefore, are allowable for depending from an allowable independent claim.

For example, regarding the anticipation rejection against claim 8 based on Kim, claim 8 recites the electrical connection of the semiconductor die to said at least one of the circuit traces includes one or more wire bonds extending from the die, through the slit, and **into at least one of the openings**. The Examiner relies on vias 228 of Kim to allegedly teach the positively recited openings (pg. 4, lines 2-3 of paper no. 20061109). However, referring to Fig. 3 of Kim, Kim teaches bonding wires 240 that contact circuitry **without extending into any one of vias 228 (alleged recited openings)**. Accordingly, it is


inconceivable that Kim teaches or suggests one or more wire bonds extending from the die, through the slit, and **into at least one of the openings** as positively recited by claim 8.

Kim fails to teach or suggest a positively recited limitation of claim 8, and therefore, claim 8 is allowable for this additional reason.

This application is now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-13-07

By:   
D. Brent Kenady  
Reg. No. 40,045